

### REMARKS

Claims 1-24 are currently pending. Dependent claims 2-4 and 23 have been amended. Applicants amended claims 2-4 and 23 pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.116, to present these claims in better form for consideration on appeal, and to comply with the Examiner's requirement of form expressly set forth in a previous Office action mailed on June 10, 2008.

Specifically, claims 2-4 are being amended to correct an inadvertent clerical error in the Amendment and Response filed October 10, 2008 where the word "it" was mistakenly amended to "the identification medium." This is a mistake because, for example, the original claim 2 reads: "Means according to claim 1, wherein it is rigidly connected to the information medium." Claim 1 in relevant part recites "[m]eans for fastening, securing or clamping goods or for securing a person ... with an information medium permanently attached thereto." Thus the word "it" clearly refers to "the means for fastening, securing or clamping goods or for securing a person." Applicants therefore respectfully request claims 2-4 be amended to replace "identification medium" with "means for fastening, securing or clamping goods or for securing a person."

In addition, support for the amendments can be found, for example, in the specification as originally filed on page 5, second full paragraph:

"Especially if the fastening means, clamping means or PSE product is made, at least in certain sections, of a textile material, for example is woven, the information medium may be attached to it in a simple manner by sewing-on. ... It is, of course, also conceivable that the information medium is glued and/or riveted to the fastening or clamping means."

Claim 23 has been amended to remove multi-dependency. The Examiner on page 2 of the Office Action mailed on June 10, 2008 objected to claim 23 under 37 C.F.R. § 1.75(c) as being in improper form. Applicants herein amend claim 23 to change its dependency from on "any one of claims 1-21" to "claim 1."

Applicants respectfully submit that no new matter has been entered by the amendments to the claims. These amendments also do not touch the merits of the application. Rather, all of the

amendments presented herein are to dependent claims and place the form of these dependent claims in better condition for appeal. (37 C.F.R. 1.116(b)(2)).

Applicants respectfully traverse the 35 U.S.C. 103(a) rejection of claims 1-22 and 24 as being unpatentable over Brinkman (US 6,105,295) in view of Liener Chin et al. (6,632,042), for at least the reasons previously submitted. Applicants will supplemental their response to this rejection in their Appeal Brief.

### CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully submit these amendments are in compliance with 37 C.F.R. §1.116 and request entry of this Amendment, prior to the filing of Applicant's Notice of Appeal. If the Examiner has any questions or concerns regarding the enclosed claim Amendment, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney.


Date: June 29, 2009

Reg. No.: 55,699

Tel. No.: (617) 526-9836

Fax No.: (617) 526-9899

Respectfully submitted,



Deborah M. Vernon  
Attorney for Applicants  
Proskauer Rose LLP  
One International Place  
Boston, MA 02110